```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
     -----x
 2
3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                V.
                                            23 Cr. 490 (SHS)
5
     JOSE URIBE,
6
                                            Plea
                    Defendant.
 7
       -----x
 8
                                            New York, N.Y.
9
                                            March 1, 2024
                                            10:00 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
12
                          HON. SIDNEY H. STEIN,
13
                                            U.S. District Judge
14
                              APPEARANCES
15
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
          United States Attorney for the
16
          Southern District of New York
     BY: LARA POMERANTZ
17
          ELI J. MARK
          DANIEL RICHENTHAL
18
          Assistant United States Attorneys
     KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES LLP
19
          Attorneys for Defendant
20
     BY: DANIEL FETTERMAN
          FRIA R. KERMANI
21
     Also Present:
22
          Christina A. Clark, DOJ; National Security Division
23
24
25
```

25

(Defendant sworn)

1 (Case called) 2 MS. POMERANTZ: Good morning, your Honor. Laura Pomerantz, for the government. With me at 3 counsel table are Eli Mark, Paul Monteleoni, and Daniel 4 5 Richenthal. 6 THE COURT: Good morning. 7 MR. FETTERMAN: Good morning, your Honor. 8 Daniel Fetterman, for defendant, Jose Uribe. With me at counsel table is Fria Kermani. 9 10 THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. 11 Do you have an application, Mr. Fetterman? MR. FETTERMAN: I do, your Honor. We wish to move to 12 13 waive proceeding by indictment and proceed with a superseding 14 information, and my client wishes to enter a guilty plea with 15 respect to that superseding information. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. 17 And this is pursuant to a plea agreement, I gather? 18 MR. FETTERMAN: It is, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: And is the agreement I have in front of 20 me, Government, identical to what was sent to my chambers last 21 night but for the signatures? 22 MS. POMERANTZ: Yes, it is, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Thank you. Please administer the oath to Mr. Uribe. 24

```
1
               THE DEFENDANT: Jose Delores Uribe, last name is
 2
      spelled U-R-I-B, as in boy, E.
 3
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 4
               You may put your hand down now, Mr. Uribe.
 5
               Mr. Uribe, do you understand that you are now under
6
      oath, sir, and if you answer any of my questions falsely, your
 7
      false or untrue answers may later be used against you in
      another prosecution for perjury or for making a false
8
9
      statement?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
11
               THE COURT: How old are you, sir?
12
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               56.
13
               THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Associates degree.
15
               THE COURT: So a year or two of college?
16
               THE DEFENDANT: Two years in college.
17
               THE COURT: Are you able to read, write, speak, and
18
      understand English?
19
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
20
               THE COURT: You're fluent in English, correct?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
22
               THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been
23
      under the care of a doctor or psychiatrist?
24
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: And what is that, a medical doctor or a
```

1	psychiatrist?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Medical doctor.
3	THE COURT: For what purpose, sir?
4	THE DEFENDANT: High blood pressure and my sugar.
5	THE COURT: High blood pressure and?
6	THE DEFENDANT: My sugar level.
7	THE COURT: High sugar level? Thank you.
8	In the past 24 hours, have you taken any drugs,
9	medicine, or pills, or consumed any alcohol?
10	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Do you take medicine for the blood
12	pressure or high sugar level?
13	THE DEFENDANT: For the high sugar for the high
14	sugar, I do.
15	THE COURT: But you haven't taken it in the past 24
16	hours; is that correct?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Correct, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized
19	for any mental illness or any type of addiction including drug
20	or alcohol addiction?
21	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Is your mind clear today, sir?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Are you feeling all right?
25	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Are you represented by an attorney here today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

O31UURIP

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And who is that?

THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Fetterman.

THE COURT: Mr. Fetterman, do you have any doubt as to Mr. Uribe's competence to plead at this time?

MR. FETTERMAN: I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Uribe, you heard Mr. Fetterman a few moments ago tell me that you wish to enter a plea of guilty to a superseding information in this case. Is that right? Do you wish to enter a plea of guilty to a superseding information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you had a full and complete opportunity to discuss your case with Mr. Fetterman and to discuss the consequences of entering a plea of guilty today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with Mr. Fetterman and his representation of you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. Uribe's responses to my questions and my observation of his demeanor as he stands here before me today, I believe he's appeared before me at least once previously in connection with this litigation, I make the finding that he's fully competent to enter an informed

plea at this time.

O31UURIP

But before I accept a plea from you, Mr. Uribe, I'm going to be asking you a series of questions. These questions are intended to satisfy me that you wish to plead guilty because you are, in fact, guilty and that you fully and completely understand the consequences of entering a plea of guilty. I'm going to be describing to you certain rights you have under the laws and Constitution of the United States, and you're going to be giving up those rights if you enter a plea of guilty today, sir.

So I want you to listen to me very carefully, and if you don't understand anything I'm asking or if you don't understand anything I'm saying to you, I want you to stop me. I'll answer any of your questions or you can ask Mr. Fetterman anything you want. My concern is to make certain that you understand everything I'm saying to you as we go along today and that you understand everything I'm asking you.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, Mr. Uribe, you have a right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you which are contained in superseding information S3 323 cr 490.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would be presumed innocent and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. You would not have to prove you are innocent at a trial.

Do you understand those rights, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, a jury composed of 12 people selected from this district would have to agree unanimously that you are guilty.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have the right to be represented by an attorney at trial and at every other stage of the proceeding.

If you cannot afford an attorney, Mr. Uribe, one will be given to you at no cost to you.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have a right to see and hear all of the witnesses against you and your attorney could cross-examine those witnesses you would have the right to have your attorney object to the government's evidence and offer evidence on your own behalf if you so desired and you would have the right to have subpoenas issued or other compulsory process used to compel witnesses to testify in your defense.

Do you understand all those rights, sir? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the 4 right to testify if you wanted to, but no one could force you 5 to testify if you did not want to. In addition, no inference 6 or suggestion of quilt could be drawn if you decided not to 7 testify at a trial. 8 Do you understand those rights, sir? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Do you understand that by entering a plea 11 of quilty today you're giving up each and every one of the 12 rights I've described, you're waiving those rights and you will 13 have no trial? 14 THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Do you understand that you have the right to change your mind right now, sir, and refuse to enter a plea 16 17 of quilty? You don't have to enter this plea of quilty if you 18 do not want to for any reason. 19 Do you understand that? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Have you received a copy of superseding 22 information S323 cr 490? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did. 24 THE COURT: Did you read it? 25 Yes, I did. THE DEFENDANT:

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Mr. Fetterman? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did. THE COURT: Did he answer any questions you may have 3 4 had about it? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he did. 6 THE COURT: Do you believe you fully understand what's 7 set forth in that superseding information? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 9 THE COURT: You have the right to have me read that 10 superseding information right now in open court, which I'm 11 perfectly happy to do. If you don't want me to read it though, 12 you have the right to waive my reading. Do you want me to read 13 it in open court or, no? 14 THE DEFENDANT: I could waive it, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Pardon me? 16 THE DEFENDANT: You don't have to read it, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: I accept that as a knowing and voluntary 18 waiver of the right to have the indictment read in open court. Do you understand that you are charged in Count One 19 20

Do you understand that you are charged in Count One with participating in a conspiracy to commit bribery from at least 2018 to 2023 in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in Count Two you're charged with participating in a conspiracy to commit honest

25

```
services wire fraud from 2018 to 2023 in violation of 18,
1
 2
      U.S.C., Section 1349?
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
 4
               THE COURT: Now, when I say those years, 2018 to 2023,
 5
      those are approximate, it's approximately 2018 to approximately
      2023.
6
 7
               Do you understand that?
 8
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
9
               THE COURT: Now, do you understand that in Count Three
10
      you're charged with honest services wire fraud from
11
      approximately 2018 to approximately 2023 in violation of
      18, U.S.C., 1343, 1346 and 2?
12
13
               Do you understand that?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: And in Count Four you're charged in
16
      participating in a conspiracy to commit obstruction of justice
17
      from approximately June 2022 until approximately 2023 in
      violation of 18, U.S.C., 371.
18
19
               Do you understand that?
20
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: And Count Five you're charged with
22
      obstruction of justice from at least June 2022 to approximately
23
      2023 in violation of 18, U.S.C., 1503 and 2.
24
               Do you understand that?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: And Count Six, sir, you're charged with committing tax evasion for the tax years 2016 through and including the tax year 2021 in violation of 26, U.S.C., 7201 and 18, U.S.C., Section 2.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Count Seven charges you with wire fraud affecting a financial institution from at least 2019 until at least 2020 in violation of 18, U.S.C., 1343 and 2.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now your attorney has said that you wanted to plead guilty to the superseding information. Do you understand that, sir, that an information is simply a charge by the government?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you know that an indictment, on the other hand, is a charge by grand jury?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you know that you have a right under the Constitution of the United States to be charged by an indictment of a grand jury rather than an information by the government?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now I have a document in front of me that's entitled waiver of indictment. I'm going to have my deputy mark it as Government Exhibit No. 1 and I'm going to have her show you this one-page document.

Is that your signature on the last page, sir?
THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand you waive the right to be charged by an indictment and that you have consented to being charged by an information by the government?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: When you waived those rights, sir, did you do so knowingly and voluntarily?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: In the relevant part of this document it states that you are being accused of the crimes you've been accused of and waives in open court prosecution by indictment and consents that the proceeding may be by information instead of by indictment.

Do you understand that, sir, that if you did not plead guilty, the government would have to prove each and every part or element of the each of the charges in that indictment beyond a reasonable doubt at a trial before a jury can convict you of the charge that they are considering?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, I'm going to ask the government to

set forth the elements of each count that the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt before a jury could convict Mr. Uribe of that particular charge.

But I'm going to ask the government to pause setting forth the elements of each and I'll do educe on the record if it's true that Mr. Uribe understands those are the elements.

Proceed.

MS. POMERANTZ: Count One charges the defendant with conspiracy to commit bribery in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371. The elements of conspiracy are, first, that two or more persons entered into the unlawful agreement charged in the information; second, that the defendant knowingly and willfully became a member of the conspiracy; third, one of the members of the conspiracy knowingly committed or caused to be committed at least one overt act to further the conspiracy.

As to the underlying object of the conspiracy, the bribery offense can be committed in multiple ways. One way is bribe offering and paying, which has the following elements: First, the payors directly or indirectly gave, offered, or promised something of value to any public official which, under the statute includes a member of Congress, or offered or promised any public official to give anything of value to any other person; and, second, the payors had the corrupt intent to influence the performance of an official act of any public

official.

The other way is bribe soliciting and receiving, which has the following elementals: First, the public official directly or indirectly demanded, sought, received, accepted, or agreed to receive or accept anything of value personally or for any other person or entity; and second, the public official had the corrupt intent to be influenced in the performance of an official act and/or conveyed that intent.

THE COURT: Mr. Uribe, do you understand that lengthy recitation sets forth the elements of Count One that the jury would have to determine that the government had proven beyond a reasonable doubt in order to convict you of Count One?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Let's go to Count Two, please.

MS. POMERANTZ: Count Two charges the defendant with conspiracy to commit honest services wire fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349. The conspiracy elements are: First, two or more persons entered the lawful agreement in the information; and second, the defendant knowingly and willfully joined the conspiracy.

As to the object of the conspiracy, honest services wire fraud, the elements are: First, there was a scheme or artifice to defraud the public out of its intangible right to Menendez' honest services as a U.S. Senator through bribery;

second, the defendant knowingly participated in the scheme to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with the specific intent to defraud; third, that the scheme or artifice to defraud involved a material misrepresentation, omission, false statement, false pretense, or concealment of facts that was material to the public; and, fourth, in executing the scheme, the defendant used or caused the use of interstate wire communications.

THE COURT: Do you understand that those are the elements that the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt at trial on --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- Count Two?

Let's proceed to Count Three.

MS. POMERANTZ: Count Three charges the defendant with honest services wire fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343, 1346, and 2.

Your Honor, I just walked through the four elements of honest services wire fraud in connection with the prior count.

If you'd like me to repeat them, I'm happy to do so.

THE COURT: I think you should. Yes.

MS. POMERANTZ: So, first, there was a scheme or artifice to defraud the public out of its intangible right to Menendez' honest services as a U.S. Senator through bribery; second, the defendant knowingly participated in the scheme to

defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with the specific intent to defraud; third, that the -- that the scheme or artifice to defraud involved a material misrepresentation, omission, false statement, false pretense of concealment of fact that was material to the public; and, fourth, in executing the scheme, the defendant used or caused the use of interstate wire communications.

THE COURT: Mr. Uribe, do you understand that those are the elements of Count Three the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's move to Count Four.

MS. POMERANTZ: Count Four charges the defendant with conspiracy to commit obstruction of justice in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

As I mentioned earlier, the elements of conspiracy are: First, that two or more persons entered into the unlawful agreement charged in the information; second, that the defendant knowingly and willfully became a member of the conspiracy; and third, one of the members of the conspiracy knowingly committed or caused to be committed at least one overt act to further the conspiracy.

As to the underlying object of the conspiracy, obstruction of justice, there are four elements, which are as follows -- excuse me, three elements which are as follows:

First, that on or about the dates set forth in the information, there was a proceeding pending before a federal court or grand jury; second, the defendant knew of the proceeding; and, third, the defendant corruptly acted to obstruct or impede or endeavor to obstruct or impede the proceeding.

THE COURT: Do you understand that those are the elements of Count Four, sir, that the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's move to Count Five.

MS. POMERANTZ: Count Five charges the defendant with obstruction of justice in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1503 and 2. The three elements which I just outlined are as follows: First, that on or about the date set forth in the information, there was a proceeding pending before a federal court or grand jury; second, the defendant knew of the proceeding; and, third, the defendant corruptly acted to obstruct or impede or endeavored to obstruct or impede the proceeding.

THE COURT: Do you understand those are the elements of Count Five, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Move to Count Six.

MS. POMERANTZ: Count Six charges the defendant with tax evasion for the calendar years 2016 through 2021 in

violation of Title 26, United States Code, 7201 and Title 18, United States Code, Section 2.

And the elements are as follows: First, that the defendant failed to file timely federal income tax returns for the particular years in question despite owing a substantial amount of federal income tax for those years; second, the defendant committed an affirmative act constituting an evasion or an attempted evasion of assessments of the tax described in the information; third, that the defendant acted knowingly and willfully.

THE COURT: Do you understand those are the elements of Count Six, sir, that the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Count Seven.

MS. POMERANTZ: Count Seven charges the defendant with wire fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code,
Section 1343 and Section 2. The four elements are: There was a scheme or artifice to defraud or to obtain money or property by materially false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises; second, the defendant knowingly devised or participated in the scheme or artifice to defraud with knowledge of its fraudulent nature and with specific intent to defraud; third, in the execution of that scheme, the defendant used or caused the use by others of interstate or foreign

wires; and, fourth, this scheme affected a financial institution.

THE COURT: As with the other counts, sir, do you understand that if you did not plead guilty the government would have to prove each of the elements of Count Seven just as it had to prove with Counts One through Six beyond a reasonable doubt at trial?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.

Now the government also has a venue requirement for each count, and the venue requirement is essentially that something in connection with each of those counts must have occurred in the Southern District of New York. That obligation on the government is simply to prove venue lies in the Southern District of New York by a preponderance of the evidence, not beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now I'm going to read to you the maximum possible penalty for each count and ask after each count that you understand, if you understand that that's the maximum possible penalty for the count.

The maximum possible penalty for Count One is five years' imprisonment plus three years' supervised release, plus a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000 or twice gross

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to individuals other than you as a result from the offense, plus a mandatory \$100 special assessment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now, sir, the maximum fine that I set forth there is repeated in Count -- and the \$100 mandatory special assessment is repeated in Counts Two, Three, Four, Five, and Six.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now the maximum penalty for Count Two is 20 years' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, and that \$250,000 fine, and the \$100 mandatory special assessment that I referred to earlier.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, I don't mean to complicate things, but the maximum \$250,000 fine and the maximum -- I'm sorry, the mandatory \$100 special assessment is imposed separately on each of Counts One through Six.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: The maximum penalty of Count Three is 20 years' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\$250,000 maximum fine I referred to, and a \$100 mandatory special assessment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do your Honor.

THE COURT: The maximum penalty on Count Four is five years' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, \$250,000 fine that I referred to earlier, and the mandatory \$100 special assessment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: The mandatory sentence on Count Five is ten years' imprisonment, plus three years' supervised release plus, again, the greatest of \$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain or twice the gross pecuniary loss to individuals other than you, plus a mandatory \$100 special assessment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: The maximum penalty for Count Six is five years' imprisonment, plus three years' supervised release, plus the maximum fine I've been referring to earlier, and the mandatory \$100 special assessment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, the maximum penalty for Count Seven is 30 years' imprisonment, plus five years supervised release,

2.2

plus a maximum fine of \$1 million or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to individuals other than you resulting from the offense, plus a \$100 mandatory special assessment, plus I must order restitution pursuant to Count Seven.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, for each of those counts, I used the term supervised release when I was describing one element of your maximum sentence, sir. Supervised release means that you're going to be subject to monitoring upon your release from prison and the monitoring is to be under terms and conditions that could lead to your re-imprisonment without a jury trial for all or part of the term of supervised release and without credit for time previously served on post-release supervision if you violate any term or condition of supervised release.

Do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, I also can order restitution to anyone injured as a result of your criminal conduct.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, you're pleading guilty to seven different and distinct counts. Do you understand that I'm going to sentence you separately on each of those seven counts?

25

sentencing guidelines, sir?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Do you also understand that I have the 3 authority to order you to serve each of those sentences 4 consecutively, meaning one after the other, or, similarly, I 5 can order you to serve them concurrently, meaning at the same 6 time, or essentially any combination thereof? 7 Do you understand that? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: If I do decide to order those sentences to 10 be searched consecutively, meaning one after the other, that 11 means you face a total maximum sentence of 95 years in prison. 12 Do you understand that? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Fetterman, I assume your client is a United States citizen; is that correct? 15 16 MR. FETTERMAN: Yes, it is, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Under current law, Mr. Uribe, there are 18 sentencing guidelines that judges such as myself must utilize 19 in applying the factors set forth in 18, U.S.C., 3553(a) to 20 determine what a fair and reasonable and appropriate sentence 21 is in your case. 22 Do you understand that? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Have you talked to Mr. Fetterman about the

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, we have.

THE COURT: Did he answer any questions you may have had about them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he did.

THE COURT: Do you understand that I will not be able to determine what the appropriate guideline range is until after I've received a presentence report completed by the probation department and you and the government have had a full opportunity to comment or object to any findings of facts set forth in that probation department report?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Now, the probation department is going to interview you. I need you to give them accurate and complete information because they're going to be asking questions about your background, your education, your finances, your family upbringing, any criminal history you may have had. They're going to be asking you a series of questions in order to provide me with facts upon which I can determine what an appropriate sentence is for you.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: So please give them accurate and complete information. Mr. Fetterman will have the right to be there, if he so chooses, during the interview.

Now, based in part on that presentence report and any

submissions of the parties and my own analysis of the sentencing guidelines, I'll determine what the appropriate guideline range is in your case.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: But after I do that, I have the ability to impose a sentence that is either higher than are called for in the guidelines or lower than are called for in the guidelines based on a departure from the guidelines.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: And even after I do that, that is first determine what the appropriate guideline range is, then determine whether there are grounds to depart either upward or downward from the guideline range, I then have the obligation under the law to apply the factors set forth in 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a) to determine what an appropriate sentence is for you.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I do understand.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you're sentenced to prison, sir, the system of parole that used to exist in the federal criminal justice system has been abolished. As a result, you will not be released from prison any earlier on parole.

25

1 Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. 3 THE COURT: And do you understand that if 4 Mr. Fetterman or any member of the defense team or any member 5 of the prosecution team, or anyone else for that matter, has 6 told you what they believe the sentence is going to be or what 7 they expect it to be or think it will be, or for that matter, they say they know what it will be, they all could be wrong. 8 9 Do you understand that? 10 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. 11 THE COURT: And even if you think you know what it's 12 going to be, you could be wrong, too. 13 Do you understand that? 14 THE DEFENDANT: I do understand. 15 THE COURT: And the reason for that, sir, is I'm the one that's going to sentence you and I don't know what your 16 17 sentence is going to be because I don't know enough information about the underlying facts of the crimes to which you're 18 19 entering a plea of guilty today and about your background. So 20 if I'm the one who is going to be sentencing you and I don't 21 know what your sentence is going to be, I assure you nobody can 22 know what your sentence is going to be. 23 Do you understand that? 24 THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: And do you understand that if your

sentence turns out to be different than what someone else has told you it might be or will be or could be or should be or ought to be, and even if it's different from what you, yourself, think it's going to be, you still are going to be bound by this guilty plea today, sir, and you won't be allowed to withdraw it.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, you heard me refer earlier to the plea agreement. It's a document dated February 29 of this year. It's seven pages. It's from Ms. Pomerantz. It's signed by Ms. Pomerantz. It's addressed to Mr. Fetterman.

I'm going to ask my deputy to mark it as Court Exhibit No. 2 and I'm going to ask her to, as before, she'll show you the last page.

Is that your signature on the last page, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you read that agreement before you signed it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Mr. Fetterman before you signed it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Did he answer any questions you may have had about it before you signed it?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he did.
2	THE COURT: Did you fully understand the agreement at
3	the time you signed it, sir?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
5	THE COURT: Does this letter agreement constitute your
6	complete and total understanding of the entire agreement
7	between the government, Mr. Fetterman, and yourself?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it does.
9	THE COURT: Is there anything about your plea and
10	sentence that's been left out of this agreement? Are there any
11	side deals I should know about?
12	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Is everything about your plea and sentence
14	contained in this agreement?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.
16	THE COURT: Do you understand that in this agreement
17	you've agreed to waive any claim of lack of or improper venue
18	with respect to Counts Six and Seven of the information?
19	THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, your Honor. Could you
20	repeat that question?
21	THE COURT: Of course. I realize we've been going for
22	quite some time. I understand.
23	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
24	MR. FETTERMAN: Your Honor, may I have one moment just
25	to explain one thing to my client?

THE COURT: Of course. And I'm going to ask the about the statute of limitations as well. So go ahead.

(Defendant conferring with counsel)

MR. FETTERMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr. Uribe, in this agreement, you waive any claim of lack of venue with respect to Counts Six and Seven, and you waive any claim of improper venue with respect to Counts Six and Seven?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you also understand that you've agreed to waive any potential statute of limitations and any potential duplicity defense in regard to Count 6?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in this agreement you've admitted the forfeiture allegations with respect to Counts One through Five and have agreed to forfeit to the United States the proceeds traceable to the commission of Counts One through Five?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you understand you've also admitted the forfeiture allegation with respect to Count Seven and have agreed to forfeit to the United States \$246,000 in United States currency representing the proceeds traceable to the commission by you of Count Seven?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you also understand that you've agreed to make restitution in an amount to be determined by me?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you've agreed to file with the IRS at least two weeks prior to the sentencing date accurate, amended individual tax returns for calendar years 2016 through 2021 and the accurate, amended corporate tax returns for a series of corporate entities that are listed in this agreement?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you understand that not only have you agreed to file accurate, amended individual tax returns and the relevant corporate tax returns, but you've also agreed to pay past taxes due and owing to the IRS for the years 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021, including any appropriate penalties?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Fetterman, do you know of any valid defense that would prevail at trial and know of any reason why Mr. Uribe should not be permitted to plead guilty today?

MR. FETTERMAN: I do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: In your view, sir, is there an adequate factual basis to support your client's plea of guilty?

MR. FETTERMAN: Yes, there is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Pomerantz, in your view, is there an adequate factual basis to support Mr. Uribe's plea today?

THE COURT: Mr. Uribe, please tell me what you did in connection with each of Counts One through Seven that you're pleading guilty to.

Now, I see you have something, I take it you're going to read from something; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

MS. POMERANTZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: It's perfectly appropriate for your attorney to have assisted you in preparing that. I don't know whether he has or not, but I need you to tell me whether or not he's written it or assisted in some way, that what you're about to tell me is true.

THE DEFENDANT: My attorney did assist me for the preparation, but these are my own words.

THE COURT: And everything in there is true, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Everything in here is true.

THE COURT: I am also, sir, going to ask you to read slowly because when people are reading from a document and when they are nervous, normally people who are pleading guilty have some degree of nervousness, they tend to speed up, and it's important that I understand what you're saying and that the court reporter be able to capture it. So please read slowly and carefully.

Sir, tell me what you did that makes you guilty of Counts One through Seven.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, as to Count One and
Three -- Count Two, Three, I agreed with several people,
including Nadine Menendez, to provide Nadine with a

Mercedes-Benz in return for Senator Menendez using his power
and influence as a United States Senator to get a favorable
outcome and to stop all investigations related to one of my
associates, and, if necessary, to stop the possible
investigation into another person who I considered to be a
member of my family. I made certain payments on the Mercedes
in a manner to conceal my involvement because I knew it was
wrong. I knew that giving a car in return for influencing a
United States Senator to stop a criminal investigation was
wrong, and I deeply regret my actions.

As to Count Four to Five, after I received a subpoena relating to Senator Menendez, Nadine Menendez contacted me through another individual. Later that afternoon, I met with Nadine at a Marriott, and she asked what was I going to say if somebody asked me about the car payments. I told her that I would say a good friend of mine was in a financial situation and I was helping that friend to make the payments on the car, and when she was financially stable, she will pay me back. Nadine says something like, that sounds good.

Later in time, I told the same story to my attorneys

at the time, and they transmitted that false story to the United States Office in New York with my approval. Late in 2022, I received a check from Nadine paying me back for the car payments. I then deposited the check.

As to Count Six, I intentionally -- I intentionally did not prioritize -- file tax returns since at least 2016 to 2022 when I understood that I had tax obligations and a duty to file those returns. I knew that this was wrong and that it would result in the government not being paid tax obligations owed by me and owed by companies that I control and manage when they were due. They were companies that were controlled and managed by me, of which I failed to file tax returns. I knew that the income for those companies would not be reported or reflected on my personal tax return as I understood that it would be reported under each individual company.

Counts -- as to Count Seven, I made up the fake tax returns in connection with bank loans in order to purchase two trailers --

THE COURT: In order to purchase?

THE DEFENDANT: Two trailers.

MR. FETTERMAN: Truck trailers, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Truck trailers.

THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: I purchased the trailers and I paid off the loans. I also instructed another person to use the

24

25

figures from the fake tax returns to get a SBA loan, which I 1 2 also paid in full. THE COURT: When you did these acts, sir, did you know 3 4 that what you were doing was wrong and illegal? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: Government, is there anything else on the 7 factual allocution that you wish? 8 You can talk amongst yourselves. 9 MS. POMERANTZ: Thank you, your Honor. 10 (Counsel confer) 11 THE COURT: Sir, I don't know whether I just asked you 12 this or not, but when you did the acts that you told me about, 13 did you know that what you were doing was wrong and illegal? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I knew. 15 THE COURT: Government? MS. POMERANTZ: Thank you, your Honor. If you could 16 17 just ask the defendant to confirm that the amount owed on the 18 income taxes for those years was a substantial amount, that he 19 knew that it was a substantial amount that was owed. 20 THE COURT: Did you know you owed a substantial amount 21 of income taxes? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I knew, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right.

interstate wire elements, the government would proffer that as

And then, also, your Honor, as to the

MS. POMERANTZ:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to Count Two and Count Three which relate to an interstate wire for honest services fraud conspiracy and honor services fraud, that the government would proffer that the defendant, while in New Jersey, asked, as his business associate referred to as associate 2 in the information, who was in the Bronx at the time, to make a financing payment for the Mercedes-Benz convertible for the benefit of Robert and Nadine Menendez. THE COURT: Did you, when you were in New Jersey, did you ask an associate who was in the Bronx to make a financing payment in connection with the Mercedes that was for the benefit and Robert and Nadine Menendez? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor. MS. POMERANTZ: And, your Honor, as to the seventh count, wire fraud, the government would proffer that the application for the SBA loan traveled across state lines. THE COURT: How so? MS. POMERANTZ: Your Honor, that the application was transmitted electronically, and so it traveled across state lines in that transmission. THE COURT: Did you transmit your SBA loan application

by wire?

THE DEFENDANT: It was done online.

THE COURT: Pardon me.

THE DEFENDANT: The application was done online, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: And where were you? Were you in New 2 Jersey at the time you made that application? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 Anything else? 6 MS. POMERANTZ: Yes, your Honor. As to the seventh 7 count that we were just discussing, one of the elements involves the scheme affecting a financial institute. If your 8 9 Honor could just confirm with the defendant that one of the 10 fake tax returns was used to get a loan from a financial 11 institution or a bank. 12 THE COURT: Is that, true, sir? Was one of the fake 13 tax returns used to obtain a loan from a financial institution 14 or a bank? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. It was. THE COURT: Government, anything else? 16 17 MS. POMERANTZ: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Fetterman, anything from the defense that you want on the allocution? 19 20 MR. FETTERMAN: No, your Honor. Thank you. 21 THE COURT: Government, tell me the evidence you have 22 against this defendant that supports Counts One through Seven. 23 MS. POMERANTZ: If the case proceeded to trial, the 24 government would prove each of the offenses through evidence, 25 including, among other things, search warrant results from

phones, email accounts, and other electronic accounts including the defendant's communications with other members of the conspiracy, records produced in response to grand jury subpoenas including from banks and financial institutions as well as records produced voluntarily, such as from government agencies, materials obtained from the IRS, and testimony from lay witnesses and law enforcement agents regarding the conduct described in the information.

THE COURT: Mr. Uribe, how do you now plead to the charges in Counts One through Seven, the superseding information S3 23 cr 490, guilty or not guilty, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty, sir, because you are guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of your own free will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because you acknowledged that you're guilty as charged in the superseding information, because I find you know your rights and are waiving them knowingly and voluntarily, because I find your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offense, I accept your guilty plea today, sir, and I adjudge you guilty of

the seven offenses to which you have pled.

Is there any bail application? Any application in regard to bail?

Government, what's your position on bail here?

MS. POMERANTZ: Your Honor, we do not object to the defendant's continued release on the bail conditions that were set at the September 27, 2023 hearing in this case.

THE COURT: Mr. Uribe, I'm going to keep you out, out of prison, that is, on the same conditions that you've been released on up until now. Do you understand that if you fail to return to this courtroom on June 13<sup>th</sup> or any adjourn date that I set for your sentencing, you're going to be guilty of a criminal act for which you could be sentenced to imprisonment separate, apart from, and in addition to any other sentence you might receive for the crimes to which you have just pled guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that you're obligated to comply with all of the conditions that you've been released on up until now?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Is there anything else, Defense?

```
MR. FETTERMAN: No, your Honor. Thank you.
1
 2
               THE COURT: Anything else, Government?
 3
               MS. POMERANTZ: No, your Honor. Thank you.
               THE COURT: All right. I thank all of you.
 4
5
                                     000
 6
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```